



Town of Duxbury Massachusetts Planning Board

TOWN CLERK
2017 SEP 15 AM 10:07
DUXBURY, MASS.

Minutes 08/09/2017

The Planning Board met on Wednesday, August 9, 2017 at 7:00 PM at the Duxbury Town Hall, 878 Tremont Street, Mural Room.

Present: David Uitti, Vice Chairman; John Bear, Brian Glennon, and Jennifer Turcotte.

Absent: Scott Casagrande, Chairman; Cynthia Ladd Fiorini, Clerk; and George Wadsworth.

Staff: Valerie Massard, Planning Director; and Diane Grant, Administrative Assistant.

Mr. Uitti called the meeting to order at 7:15 PM due to a delayed arrival which affected the quorum.

OPEN FORUM

No items were brought forward for Open Forum.

ANR PLAN OF LAND (CONTINUED): 36 WASHINGTON STREET / ENDRESEN & DUNDAS

Present for the discussion was the applicant, Mr. Mark Endresen. Planning Board members reviewed a revised plan that had been submitted on August 2, 2017 as well as a newly revised plan that was submitted to the Planning Office on August 3, 2017 and distributed at tonight's meeting. Ms. Massard explained the changes to the ANR plan:

- The word "subdivide" on Note 1 on the ANR plan was changed to "divide"
- The parcel to be conveyed is labelled as "Parcel A" instead of "Lot 1" and the former "Lot 2" has been changed to "Lot 1"
- Tie lines have been added
- Note 1 has been revised to clearly identify that the intention is to create Parcel A for the purposes of conveying and then combining the Duxbury Marketplace parcels with Parcel A
- The question mark after the Book and Page identifying 28 Washington Street was removed.

In addition, Ms. Massard explained that the area notes on the plan were edited to clarify that a five-foot wide neck on the plan is not counted toward the area of Lot 1.

Mr. Uitti stated that the only ambiguous issue remaining is the conveyance of Parcel A to be combined with a larger lot that was formerly four parcels, and Ms. Massard responded that the Planning Board only regulates lot line changes and the property owners are allowed to combine lots. Mr. Glennon noted that it appears that Parcel A will be added to the properties owned by Duxbury Marketplace and that all the lots at Duxbury Marketplace will be joined together. Ms. Massard stated that the owner of Duxbury Marketplace has approved this plan and the deed will reference the plan. Mr. Bear asked what if the deal does not go forward, and Ms. Massard replied that the Registry of Deeds would not accept a plan combining it into one ownership without a deed showing that the land has been conveyed.

Mr. Glennon noted that the existing property lines between Parcel A and Lot 1 had not been darkened as requested. Ms. Massard stated that it might be unfair to ask the applicant to wait for the next Planning Board meeting. Mr. Glennon stated that he would prefer that the line be darkened. Mr. Endresen stated that he would agree to change the plan. Ms. Turcotte, who is a professional engineer, offered to change the line from a dashed line to a solid line.

MOTION: Mr. Glennon made a motion, and Ms. Turcotte provided a second, to endorse an ANR Plan of Land for Washington Street / Endresen & Dundas entitled, "Approval Not Required Plan of Land, 36 Washington Street, Duxbury, MA," dated August 2, 2017, prepared by J. Lowell Associates in Pembroke and stamped and signed by Lloyd Jeff Lowell, RPLS on August 2, 2017, scale 1" = 40' as not requiring approval under Subdivision Control Law, subject to a change from a dashed line to a solid line.

VOTE: The motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

Ms. Turcotte darkened the lines in question on the mylar and one paper copy. Planning Board members signed the mylar and the paper copy of the ANR plan.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING, DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION: 1065 SUMMER STREET / TEDESCHI

Mr. Uitti opened the continued public hearing at 7:24 PM. No one was present to represent the application. Ms. Massard stated that revised plans are expected to be submitted for review at the next Planning Board meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Glennon made a motion, and Ms. Turcotte provided a second, to continue the public hearing for the Definitive Subdivision at 1065 Summer Street / Tedeschi to Wednesday, September 13, 2017 at 7:15 PM.

VOTE: The motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING, DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION: EVENTIDE, 0, 397, 401 & 405 WASHINGTON STREET / DIAMOND SINACORI

Mr. Uitti opened the continued public hearing at 7:25 PM. The correspondence list for the record:

- Correspondence List and Sign-In sheet for initial public hearing on 07/26/17
- Email from T. Kelso to D. Grant dated 07/27/17 re: Town Historian street name - Eventide
- "Information Needed for Fiscal Analysis" spreadsheet submitted by G. Wadsworth at PB meeting on 07/26/17
- Cover letter from B. McKenzie to PB and Conservation Commission dated 07/31/17 re: Response to Amory Engineers Preliminary Engineering Review of Eventide
- Revised plans dated 07/31/17
- Emails between A. Chartier and V. Massard et al dated 07/27/17 – 08/01/17 re: Eventide Subdivision – Plan Request
- Duxbury Clipper article, "Battelle Focus on Marine Life," dated 08/02/17
- Letter from P. Brennan of Amory Engineers dated 08/03/17 re: Peer review of Eventide Definitive Subdivision
- Emails between P. Brennan and V. Massard et al dated 08/03/17 re: Eventide Subdivision
- Emails from V. Massard to B. McKenzie et al dated 08/03/17 re: Amory Review Comments
- Mullin Rule form submitted by D. Uitti and stamped with Town Clerk on 08/08/17.

TOWN CLERK
2017 SEP 15 AM 10:07
DUXBURY, MASS

Present to represent the applicants were Atty. Robert W. Galvin and Mr. Brad McKenzie of McKenzie Engineering. Also present was Mr. Patrick Brennan of Amory Engineers, the town's consulting engineer. Mr. Uitti invited the applicants to present revised plans.

Atty. Galvin noted that at the last meeting the applicants had not had enough time to review comments from the town's consulting engineer on the latest plan revisions. Atty. Galvin stated that the applicants have hired a hydrologist, Mr. Peter Dillon, to provide information on nitrogen and phosphorous contaminants. Atty. Galvin stated that he had received a copy of Mr. Wadsworth's financial analysis of the proposed subdivision but did not wish to discuss it tonight.

Mr. McKenzie of McKenzie Engineering stated that revised plans were submitted on July 31, 2017 to address comments raised by Mr. Brennan, the town's consulting engineer, in his letter dated July 10, 2017. Mr. Brennan has now submitted a letter dated August 3, 2017 with further comments. Mr. McKenzie summarized revisions made to date:

- Grading has been modified to reduce overall impacts to the site, especially Zone AE and the Wetlands Protection Overlay District (WPOD).
- Reduced grading at 397 Washington Street.
- Pulled grading away from the 100-foot buffer zone for Lots D, E, and F.
- Earthwork analysis performed for the demolition of structures and utilities
- A new demolition site plan has been added
- Structures near the water are clearly identified as to which buildings will be razed and which ones will remain
- Pre-treatment has been added at the cul-de-sac
- Minor changes to the typical roadway section have been made as requested.

Mr. McKenzie noted that the dwellings at 397 Washington Street and 405 Washington Street are proposed to remain, and the boathouse near the water will remain also. He noted that there will still be a significant amount of land to be disturbed. He noted that they reduced the cover over a pipe at the cul de sac to under 2.5 feet so that a waiver will not be required.

Mr. Uitti invited Mr. Brennan, the town's consulting engineer, to provide any comments. Mr. Brennan stated that Ms. Massard and Mr. Scott Lambiase, Municipal Services Director, had raised question about the fill and grading for roadway construction and lot development, so Mr. Brennan recommended that the applicants provide a roadway and site development grading plan. Mr. Glennon noted that considering the proximity to the bay and shellfishing, the Planning Board is especially interested to make sure that stormwater runoff is captured and treated.

Mr. Brennan stated that a note on the grading plan says that the plan shows the best guess at where the runoff is going. He stated that the original stormwater basin is under the jurisdiction of the Wetlands Protection Act and originally it was proposed to fill it but now the applicants have decided not to fill it. He stated that grading at Lots E and F will require filings with the Conservation Commission for work within the 100-foot buffer. However, no filing is needed for the roadway construction. Mr. Brennan stated that it is difficult to determine whether the grading will be under the jurisdiction of the Planning Board or the Building Department.

Ms. Massard suggested adding a mutually agreed upon condition to the final decision that individual lots are subject to engineering review for grading and compacting soil for simplification regarding jurisdiction and regulation of the fill if it is done according to plan on the individual lots, acknowledging that it could end up being different and allowing for the same. Ms. Turcotte noted that building permits cannot be issued until lots are released. Ms. Massard stated that the lots can be built upon prior to sale and prior to completion of the road or a lot release, so this condition could be helpful.

Mr. Brennan suggested a condition that on individual lots that drainage must not be altered from the approved subdivision plan. Ms. Massard noted that if changes are shown for drainage on the lots, review by an engineer to certify that drainage on individual lots that vary from the plans will be needed to demonstrate that subdivision drainage will not be affected. Atty. Galvin noted that Lots E and F will be reviewed by the Conservation Commission and the Board of Health when they are developed. He stated that the applicants are amenable to engineering review if needed. Mr. McKenzie stated that he is not sure the grading can be changed significantly and some fill will be required. Ms. Massard suggested that an inspection may be required for compaction of soils.

Mr. McKenzie stated that the applicants would be happy to prepare a grading/filling site plan. He agreed that the limit of jurisdiction for grading and filling is not clear between the Planning Board and Building Department. He stated that while there are specific requirements within the 50-foot layout, he could not find any pertinent requirements in the Subdivision Rules and Regulations.

Mr. Brennan stated that he has suggested that the applicants work with the Planning Board to come up with a reasonable limit to the number of trees to be removed. He noted that the Tree Warden may be involved with street trees. He stated that the number of trees, the type and location should be identified. Atty. Galvin stated that the applicants are amenable to such a condition.

Mr. Brennan suggested that there should be a condition that the drainage system is to remain private in perpetuity. Atty. Galvin agreed to that condition. Ms. Massard noted that such a condition is unenforceable because Town Meeting has the final say on whether a roadway should be accepted. Mr. Bear noted that often final approvals are conditioned with this type of intent, and Ms. Massard agreed that it is a good idea to include this intention. Mr. Glennon asked if all of the issues of Mr. Brennan's first review letter have been addressed, and Mr. Brennan replied that only minor issues remain that can be resolved.

Mr. Bear asked how high the proposed retaining walls would be, and Mr. McKenzie replied that they are four feet in height. Ms. Massard noted that Building Code will require review of the retaining wall at the time of grading.

Mr. Uitti asked the applicant's specialist, Mr. Peter Dillon, to present his hydrological findings. Mr. Dillon provided his credentials. He stated that the focus of his work on this project was the treatment of nutrients after discharge. He stated that phosphorous is relatively immobile although some breakthrough is possible. Four feet of separation is generally required and the minimum is five feet in Duxbury. He stated that if phosphorous gets into the ground it does not attenuate well. Mr. Dillon stated that there is plenty of phosphorous in the ocean already and stated that in his opinion it is not an issue.

Mr. Dillon stated that nitrogen is generally a limiting factor, referencing Subdivision Rules & Regulations Appendix G. He noted that the proposed project is not in the Aquifer Protection Overlay District. He stated that he was asked to look at calculations of nitrogen loading based on Appendix G and his calculations resulted in 4.45 milligrams per liter, which is under the minimum of 5 milligrams per liter. He stated that the applicant is willing to go above and beyond the requirements and asked him to look into a FAST (Fixed Activated Sludge Treatment) system and explained how the FAST system works. He stated that a FAST system would reduce the nitrogen loading by nearly half. Ms. Turcotte recalled that the Planning Board had approved the use of a similar type of septic system at another subdivision, Deer Run on Birch Street, which was located in a Zone II area. Mr. Glennon asked if this is an electronic system, what would happen when the power goes out? Mr. Dillon responded that he was not sure but those systems generally come with a maintenance contract. Ms. Turcotte stated that the FAST system is not the only solution and the important factor is advanced treatment.

Mr. Uitti asked that assuming advanced treatment, what would be the impact to the bay? Mr. Dillon replied that he looked further than running drainage calculations; he reviewed the concentration of discharge. He stated that the length of the coast at the property is 479 meters and the amount of nitrogen on a daily basis should come to 0.6 milligrams per cubic meter. Mr. Uitti asked why that is a good result, and Mr. Dillon responded that Appendix B references 200 milligrams per liter, and the results are well below this number.

Mr. Bear asked if the applicants had considered moving the Shore House at the bottom of the hill to a new lot. Atty. Galvin replied that the applicants are considering that, noting that it is over 75 years old and may be considered historic. Atty. Galvin stated that they are not sure if it could be moved but they would consider it an alternative. Mr. Bear stated that it would add to the restoration of the property because it may be the oldest structure on the site. Atty. Galvin stated that other structures are actually older, dating to the early 1800s. Atty. Galvin stated that the developer, Mr. Merrill Diamond, considers himself an expert on adaptive re-use and may try to save it if it is cost effective to do so.

Mr. Uitti invited public comment. Ms. Lorrie Hall of 175 Abrams Hill stated asked if the applicants intend to leave any of the large number of old trees on the property. Mr. McKenzie responded that the trees around the proposed cul de sac and Shore House will not remain. He stated that trees along Bayside Marine (abutting property to the north) and along the shoreline will remain. In addition, the trees along 397 Washington Street will remain. He stated that overall the developers will try not to cut down trees if possible. Ms. Hall cautioned that if trees are removed in the

middle of the lot it will be bare, ugly and hot. Ms. Hall asked if the developers would consider putting the historic houses on Washington Street in a Local Historic District, and asked how the houses will be marketed. Mr. Uitti pointed out that some of Ms. Hall's comments have nothing to do with the subdivision approval and advised Ms. Hall to speak with Atty. Galvin privately.

Mr. David Amory of 18 Puritan Road noted that the historic nature of the buildings and trees on the property create value. He asked if the Planning Board would condition the preservation of those houses and trees in order to maintain the special character of the site as a benefit to the town. Ms. Massard stated that the Planning Board has no jurisdiction over saving the historic homes and instead should focus on reasonable and safe access to the new lots. She stated that preservation is optional for the developers and the Planning Board has no opportunity to impose such conditions.

Mr. Uitti noted that revised plans will be required, and Ms. Massard suggested a continued public hearing date of September 13, noting that the act-on deadline is the end of September. Atty. Galvin asked if a new grading plan for the roadway should be submitted, and Ms. Massard replied that it could be used as an exhibit but for recording purposes is not necessary, and Ms. Turcotte agreed. Atty. Galvin noted that there needs to be further discussion on grading of lots, and Mr. Glennon added that trees could be discussed further.

Mr. Uitti encouraged the applicants to consider saving mature trees where possible, allowing that some trees simply cannot be saved. He noted that Subdivision Rules & Regulations Section 12 mentions wooden tree guards or tree wells as a protection to mature trees that are designated to be saved, noting that trees can get harmed during construction. He requested that the applicants identify mature trees that can be saved and how they will be protected, noting that it will go a long way toward satisfying public concerns. Atty. Galvin stated that the applicants have no intention of clear cutting the property, noting that they have hired a landscape architect to design a boulevard of grand trees along the roadway. He stated that he suspects that the applicants will be installing high end landscaping. Mr. Uitti noted that sometimes best intentions are different than actual results during construction.

Mr. Frank Holden of 350 Powder Point Avenue stated that he supported the continuance of the public hearing and stated that he shares Mr. David Amory's point of view on the project and its impact on the bay.

Mr. Tag Carpenter of the Historical Commission stated that the applicants have not completed applications for demolition delay to date.

Mr. Glennon requested that revised plans and information be submitted by the applicant in a timely fashion so that the town's consulting engineer has ample time to provide written comments to the Planning Board in advance of the next public hearing. He stated that materials distributed on the night of the meeting are a distraction.

MOTION: Mr. Glennon made a motion, and Ms. Turcotte provided a second, to continue the public hearing for the Eventide Definitive Subdivision, 0, 397, 401 & 405 Washington Street / Diamond Sinacori to Wednesday, September 13, 2017 at 7:20 PM.

VOTE: The motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

MODIFICATION OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE SITE PLAN REVIEW: 438 WASHINGTON STREET & 23 MATTAKEESET COURT / DUXBURY YACHT CLUB

Present for the discussion representing the Duxbury Yacht Club was Mr. Rick Holden and the Duxbury Yacht Club's engineer, Mr. Brendan Sullivan of Cavanaro Consulting in Norwell. Also present was the town's consulting engineer, Mr. Mark Nelson of Horsley Witten Group in Sandwich. Ms. Massard provided some background, noting that the Planning Board approved a site plan in 2011 for a parking lot design and stormwater treatment. The parking lot was subsequently built several years ago with field changes that were not approved and without the benefit of inspections by the town's consulting engineer. When the applicants requested As-Built approval earlier this year, Mr. Nelson discovered the discrepancies. Ms. Massard reported that she and Mr. Nelson have met on site with the

applicants and there has been a good deal of discussion in trying to reach a compromise on completing work as approved. She stated that at this point the Yacht Club would rather proceed with minor changes that are not adequate based on what was approved and so there is no agreement.

Mr. Glennon noted that he was on the Planning Board when the project was approved. He requested a summary of what was approved and what was built. Mr. Sullivan provided a summary, stating that the project encompassed two lots, one of which was a single-family dwelling lot that the Yacht Club purchased for office space. The Planning Board approved a new parking lot using pavers with a turnaround, two rain gardens, and a small retaining wall. The project was constructed in 2011 or 2012 and has been in place for five or six years now. In addition to the Administrative Site Plan Review, a new septic system and new sidewalks were installed.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the parking area uses pea stone rather than pavers and it is a sandy area that drains well. The timber retaining wall exceeds the four feet in height that the Planning Board approved. A note from the contractor states that a "deadman" was used to construct the wall and the wall is still in place with no swing. Arborvitae has been planted as a screening to abutting the property. He noted that the rain gardens needed attention because they were full of dead leaves and brush. He stated that there is an outlet to a larger rain garden and runoff flows into the rain garden.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the Duxbury Yacht Club proposes to construct a trench drain at the top of the slope to discharge runoff down to the rain garden, and to trim the hedges along Mattakeeset Court for better sight lines. He also noted that the turnaround was not installed as required. Mr. Glennon asked why changes were made from the approved plan, and both Mr. Holden and Mr. Sullivan responded that they did not know why.

Ms. Massard noted that the changes made were never approved by the Planning Board. She noted that using pavers on the parking lot is too expensive and this was an apparently "understood" reason why the Yacht Club used pea stone but it was never formally approved, based on her conversations with those involved. She noted that grading of the parking lot toward the rain garden did not happen, and Mr. Joseph Grady, Conservation Administrator, has observed that most of the stormwater discharges onto Mattakeeset Court. Mr. Sullivan stated that he was unaware of this observation.

Mr. Nelson, the town's consulting engineer, confirmed that at his site visit he discovered that the project had not been built according to the approved plan. He stated that the upper rain garden does not appear to be capturing runoff. He noted that the rain garden on the south side of the property was supposed to have been larger, and it appears that the elevation was raised in order to remove it from the floodplain. Ms. Turcotte stated that that must be the reason the retaining walls were built higher than permitted.

Mr. Nelson noted that the purpose of the original rain garden design was to provide pretreatment of stormwater before it runs down to the rain garden. The swale was designed to capture water from the driveway into the swale. Instead of a gravel trench as approved there is a flat parking lot with no collection of stormwater. He stated that the swale is important and does more than the proposed trench drain which will fill with leaves. He stated that the swale allows the pretreatment that the Planning Board intended, and regrading would not provide much better results than a trench.

Mr. Nelson recommended that vegetation be cut down to provide a sight line. He recommended that a structural engineer be retained to review the retaining wall that was built more than four feet in height and in some places exceeds five feet. He stated that the wall was supposed to slope to minimize its height.

Mr. Bear noted that substantial changes have been made to the parking lot, and utilizing pavers with grass spacing would provide more opportunity for stormwater runoff to be treated. He asked if the applicants would consider changing the elevation and material. Ms. Massard responded that the discussion has focused more on grading solutions because it would be expensive to now place pavers in the parking lot, and that the town's engineer agrees that the pea stone and sand infiltrate as well as the grassed pavers (originally approved) would have functioned.

Mr. Bear noted that the existing gravel would need to be removed in order to regrade the parking lot. Mr. Nelson stated that it is possible that only the bottom half of the parking lot would need to be regraded.

Mr. Glennon asked if there might be other alternatives to capturing stormwater runoff, such as drywells.

Ms. Massard stated that the town staff is open to ideas on how to meet the goal of capturing runoff in the cheapest, most effective way. Mr. Glennon noted that water quality of the bay is at stake, similar to the proposed Eventide subdivision that was discussed earlier tonight.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the rain garden is functioning better now that it has been cleaned out. Mr. Holden emphasized that the rain gardens were not neglected and they are cleaned at least annually.

Mr. Nelson added that at the height built, the retaining walls need to be reviewed by a structural engineer.

Ms. Massard noted that this was also a concern of the Building Inspector. Mr. Sullivan stated that the applicants propose to take down the wall to under four feet. Mr. Uitti requested that the applicants to work together with town staff and the consulting engineer to work out drainage issues. Ms. Massard noted that so far the plans that the applicants have proposed have been deemed inadequate by the consulting engineer and Planning Board. Mr. Bear stated that the basic contour of the parking lot needs to be addressed.

Mr. Nelson provided an additional summary:

- The swale is important to providing pretreatment of runoff
- A small trench drain may capture a portion of the runoff from the driveway
- North rain garden needs to capture runoff from both sides of the wall
- The rain garden approach may be appropriate and may be effective
- Make sure the rain garden is sized appropriately by extending it around the corner as approved
- Ensure maintenance continues on a regular basis
- Observation of water patterns to evaluate grading may be needed.

Mr. Uitti expressed confidence that both parties can work in good faith to resolve the issues.

MOTION: Ms. Turcotte made a motion, and Mr. Glennon provided a second, to continue the public meeting for a modification of an Administrative Site Plan Review of the Duxbury Yacht Club, 438 Washington Street and 23 Mattakeeset Court, to Wednesday, September 27, 2017 at 7:05 PM.

VOTE: The motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Comprehensive Plan Update: Ms. Massard displayed a Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) poster with a summary of demographics of the Town of Duxbury. She stated that the survey and Envision Duxbury web site have gone live, and MAPC is printing additional business cards with links to the online survey. A press release has been prepared for next week's Duxbury Clipper. A hard copy of surveys will be distributed throughout the town.

Ms. Massard summarized trends in the demographics. She noted that there has been a large increase in the population of residents aged 65 and older and the trend is expected to continue as residents age in place. There has been a decline in population aged 25-44 and also in ages 45-55. She noted that older folks would like to downsize but opportunities are limited. Mr. Glennon asked about the source of demographic data, and Ms. Massard replied that information was taken from the 2010 U.S. Census and American Community Survey (ACS) data. Mr. Glennon asked if there is any reason to believe demographics have changed since 2010, and Ms. Massard responded that the numbers match Town Clerk's records.

Ms. Massard urged the public to fill out the survey and links can be found on Instagram and Twitter. She stated that the Comprehensive Plan depends on the town's input in order to move forward. She stated that representatives from MAPC will attend the Planning Board's meeting in October.

878 Tremont Street, Duxbury, MA 02332; Telephone: 781-934-1100 x 5476; www.town.duxbury.ma.us/planning

TOWN CLERK
2017 SEP 15 AM 10:08
DUXBURY, MASS

Mr. Uitti suggested a challenge similar to the ALS challenge where one family would challenge another family to fill out the survey. Ms. Massard noted that any age can fill it out.

Ms. Massard noted that she is working with the Camera Club on photographic contributions of favorite spots in Duxbury. Any other photographs can be submitted to the Planning Office, or uploaded via Instagram using the hashtag #EnvisionDuxbury created by MAPC.

OTHER BUSINESS

Meeting Minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Wadsworth made a motion, and Ms. Ladd Fiorini provided a second, to approve meeting minutes of June 28, 2017 as written.

VOTE: The motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

MOTION: Mr. Bear made a motion, and Mr. Uitti provided a second, to approve meeting minutes of July 12, 2017 as written.

VOTE: The motion carried 3-0-1, with Ms. Turcotte abstaining.

Engineering Invoices: Planning Board members reviewed two invoices submitted by Amory Engineers today and requested that they be placed on the next Planning Board agenda so they would have more time to review them.

MBTA Letter: Planning Board members reviewed an email from Mr. Richard Prone, Duxbury's MBTA Advisory Board representative, to the MBTA dated July 31, 2017 noting the MBTA's failure to schedule trains that would make it convenient for families to travel by train to recent events in Boston such as the Tall Ships or Fourth of July fireworks. Mr. Glennon praised Mr. Prone as a terrific advocate for the town, noting that he raised a number of valid points in his letter. Ms. Turcotte and Mr. Uitti agreed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board meeting adjourned at 9:18 PM. The next Planning Board meeting will take place on Wednesday, September 13, 2017 at 7:00 PM at the Duxbury Town Hall, Mural Room.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- PB agenda for 08/09/17
- ANR plans (one submitted 08/02/17 and another submitted 08/03/17) for 36 Washington Street / Endresen & Dundas
- Email from V. Massard to R. Grady et al dated 08/02/17 re: Tedeschi's project – continuance date?
- Letter from T. Borg to PB dated 07/15/17 re: location of private drilled well location on abutting property
- Cover letter from B. McKenzie of McKenzie Engineering Group dated 07/31/17 re: Eventide revised plans
- Revised plans dated 07/31/17 for Eventide Definitive Subdivision
- Executive Summary of Drainage Calculations and Stormwater Management Plan for Eventide Definitive Subdivision
- Public meeting notice for NYC Modification of ASPR stamped with Town Clerk on 08/01/17
- ASPR Modification application for NYC stamped with Town Clerk on 08/01/17
- Minor Modification Plan, latest revision 07/26/17 submitted to Planning Office on 07/31/17
- As-Built Plan 2017 marked-up / staff for NYC
- Approved Site Plan 2011 for NYC
- Approved LS Plan 2011 for NYC
- Assessor's property cards for NYC
- ASPR Decision for NYC dated 06/16/11
- Email from M. Nelson to V. Massard et al dated 05/04/17 re: NYC
- Letter from M. Nelson of Horsley Witten Group to V. Massard dated 06/12/17 re: Review of proposed NYC modification plan dated 05/26/17
- Letter from B. Sullivan to V. Massard dated 07/26/17 re: response to Nelson letter dated 07/21/17
- Letter from M. Nelson of HW to V. Massard dated 07/27/17 re: Response to NYC letter of 07/26/17
- PB draft minutes of 06/28/17

878 Tremont Street, Duxbury, MA 02332; Telephone: 781-934-1100 x 5476; www.town.duxbury.ma.us/planning

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Date: August 9, 2017

Page 9 of 9

Approved 09/13/17

- PB draft minutes of 07/12/17
- ZBA Decision for 622 Congress Street / Standish Humane Society
- Email from A. Murray to PB et al dated 08/01/17 re: Duxbury FMCB comment 07/31/17 (Prone letter to MBTA)

Distributed at Meeting:

- Revised ANR Plan of Land for 36 Washington Street / Endresen & Dundas, submitted to PB on 08/03/17
- Email from R. Grady to V. Massard et al dated 08/08/17 re: Tedeschi's project -- continuance date?
- Letter from P. Brennan of Amory Engineers to PB and Conservation Commission dated 08/03/17 re: review of Eventide revised plans dated 07/31/17
- Email from V. Massard to B. McKenzie et al dated 08/03/17 re: Planning Director comments on Eventide
- Amory Engineers invoice #14733A dated 08/01/17 re: Eventide
- Amory Engineers invoice #14733B dated 08/01/17 re: Eventide

TOWN CLERK
2017 SEP 15 AM 10:08
DUXBURY, MASS.